

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-12 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 6, 7 and 10 are amended. Support for the amendments to these claims may be found in Fig. 1, for example. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments above and the remarks below is respectfully requested.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 because the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed below; (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration as the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution; and (c) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments were not presented earlier because they are made in response to arguments raised in the Office Action. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

The Office Action objects to claim 6. The amendment to claim 6 overcomes the objection. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0196833 to Dahan, in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0031086 to Welin, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0075521 to Oobayashi, Japanese Patent Application Laid-Open No. JP-A-2002-044363 to Murata and U.S. Patent No. 6,887,796 to Iizuka; rejects claims 3 and 11 under U.S.C. §103(a) over Dahan, Welin, Oobayashi, Murata, and Iizuka, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,042,028 to Ogawa; rejects claims 4, 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Dahan, Welin, Oobayashi, Murata, and Iizuka, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0193696 to Walker; rejects claim 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Dahan, Welin, Oobayashi and Murata; rejects claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Dahan, Welin, Oobayashi and Murata, and further in view of Japanese Patent Application Laid-Open

No. JP-A-2003-060836; and rejects claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Dahan, Welin, Oobayashi and Murata, and further in view of Ogawa.

The Office Action asserts, on page 3, that Dahan discloses "a facsimile modem that is connected to the voice encoding/decoding unit and modulates and demodulates a facsimile signal ... [and] a first T30 protocol control unit that is connected to the facsimile modem and controls a T30 facsimile protocol." Dahan does not disclose "a facsimile modem that is directly connected to the voice encoding/decoding unit and modulates and demodulates a facsimile signal ... [and] a first T30 protocol control unit that is directly connected to the facsimile modem," as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 7 and 10.

The Office Action asserts, on page 3, that encoder 220 and decoder 218 in Dahan Fig. 6 correspond to the voice encoding/decoding unit, that data pump 333 (Fig. 3) corresponds to the facsimile modem and that fax machine 107 (Fig. 2) inherently discloses a first T30 protocol unit. However, data pump 333 is not directly connected to fax machine 107. Rather data pump 333 is connected to T.38 unit 331, which relates to a T.38 facsimile protocol and **not** a first T30 protocol control unit, as recited in claims 1, 7 and 10. Any T30 protocol unit in fax machine 107 (Fig. 2) is far removed from data pump 333 (Fig. 3) and separated by switch network 112, for example. Thus, Dahan does not disclose, and would not have suggested, "a facsimile modem that is directly connected to the voice encoding/decoding unit and modulates and demodulates a facsimile signal ... [and] a first T30 protocol control unit that is directly connected to the facsimile modem," as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 7 and 10. The other applied references are not applied in any manner that would overcome the above-identified shortfall in the application of Dahan to the subject matter recited in claims 1, 7 and 10.

In view of the above, the combination of applied references would not have suggested the subject matter recited in claims 1, 7 and 10. The remaining claims variously depend from

claims 1, 7 and 10. Thus, the combination of applied references would not have suggested the subject matter recited in these claims for at least their dependence on an allowable base claims, and also for the additional subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1 and 3-12 are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1 and 3-12 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Kipman T. Werking
Registration No. 60,187

JAO:KTW/acd

Date: September 16, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--